

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated March 24, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1-16 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, and 12 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4, 5, 8-13, 15, and 16 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7, 10-13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakamoto et al. (US Patent 6,069,678), hereinafter "Sakamoto". Claims 8, 9, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Nishida et al. (US Patent Publication 2005/0174521), hereinafter "Nishida". Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishida.

The rejection of claims 1-7, 10-13, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakamoto is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant submits that Sakamoto does not disclose each and every element of the claims and therefore does not anticipate the claims. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and Applicants submit that the rejection of these claims is moot. Applicants submit that Sakamoto does not anticipate claims 1, 4, 5, 10-13, 15 and 16, because Sakamoto does not disclose either explicitly or inherently every element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "a passivation layer over the source electrode, drain electrode and semiconductor layer, and wherein the pixel electrode is formed on the passivation layer." Applicant notes that claim 1 as amended recites the subject matter originally recited in claim 7. In the Office Action, the Examiner states, "Regarding to claim 7, Sakamoto discloses the pixel electrode formed on the passivation layer." Applicants submit that Sakamoto contains no disclosure relevant to forming the pixel electrode on the passivation layer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakamoto does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicants note that claims 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and recite all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakamoto does not anticipate claims 4 and 5 at least by way of the dependencies of claims 4 and 5 from claim 1.

Claim 10 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having features including “at least one pixel electrode formed on a passivation layer in each pixel.” Applicant Applicants submit that Sakamoto contains no disclosure relevant to forming the pixel electrode on the passivation layer. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakamoto does not anticipate claim 10.

Applicants note that claim 11 depends from claim 10 and recites all of the limitations of claim 10. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakamoto does not anticipate claim 11 at least by way of the dependency of claim 11 from claim 1.

Claim 12 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having features including “wherein the passivation layer is formed of one of BCB (Benzo-Cyclo-Butene) and photoacryl.” Sakamoto states, “Subsequently, the SiN (insulator) is deposited to about 1500 Å through the CVD process to form the passivation film 2605.” See Sakamoto, column 11, lines 18-20. Sakamoto contains no disclosure relevant a passivation layer “formed of one of BCB (Benzo-Cyclo-Butene) and photoacryl.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakamoto does not anticipate claim 12.

Applicants note that claims 13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 12 and recite all of the limitations of claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Sakamoto does not anticipate claim 13, 15, and 16 at least by way of their respective dependencies from claim 12.

The rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Nishida is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 14 is moot. Applicants submit that claims 8 and 9 are allowable over Sakamoto and Nishida because the cited references do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims, and because there is no motivation to combine Sakamoto and Nishida outside of Applicants’ specification.

Claim 8 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having features including “a passivation layer over the source electrode, drain electrode and semiconductor layer, and wherein the passivation layer is formed of an organic material.” The Examiner in the Office Action correctly acknowledges that Sakamoto does not disclose, “the passivation layer is formed of an organic material.” The Examiner relies on Nishida to cure the deficiency in the teaching of Sakamoto. Applicants submit that Nishida does not disclose a passivation layer formed of an

organic material. Applicants submit that Sakamoto and Nishida, analyzed singly or in any combination do not teach each and every element of claim 8, and that accordingly claim 8 is allowable over Sakamoto and Nishida.

As motivation for combining Sakamoto and Nishida, the Examiner states, "In light of Nishida, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use one of BCB and photacryl as the passivation layer in Sakamoto's display device since Sakamoto does not disclose any specific material for the passivation insulation layer." Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Sakamoto. Sakamoto states, "Subsequently, the SiN (insulator) is deposited to about 1500 Å through the CVD process to form the passivation film 2605." See Sakamoto, column 11, lines 18-20. Applicant submits that Sakamoto does disclose a material for the passivation layer, and that no motivation outside of the Applicants specification has been provided for combining the teachings of Sakamoto and Nishida to make the combination recited in claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 8 is allowable over Sakamoto and Nishida for at least this additional reason.

Applicants note that claim 9 depends from claim 8 and recites all of the limitations of claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is allowable over Sakamoto and Nishida at least by way of its dependency on claim 8, and for the reasons given above for claim 8.

The rejection of claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nishida is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants submit that claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by Nishida because Nishida does not disclose inherently or implicitly each and every element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "a passivation layer over the source electrode, drain electrode and semiconductor layer, and wherein the pixel electrode is formed on the passivation layer." Applicant submits that Nishida does disclose at least this feature recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Nishida.

Claim 10 recites an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device having a combination of features including "at least one pixel electrode formed on a passivation layer in each pixel;" Applicant submits that Nishida does disclose at least this feature recited by claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 10 is not anticipated by Nishida.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 19, 2006

By Valerie P. Hayes ^{Reg. No.} 53,005
for **Rebecca G. Rudich**
Registration No. 41,786
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant